


VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

Our 7,000-Year History Of World Navigation and Its Destruction By Jews

Posted on **19 June 2013** by [wwwjames](#)

Our 7,000-Year History Of World Navigation And The Jews' Destruction Of It




The linked forensic-science site says the skulls are: (A) Caucasoid, (B) Negroid, (C) Mongoloid. "Caucasian" is a term used to include — and hide — jews. The sloping forehead and heavy brow ridges of the top skull make it much more likely to be an Ashkenazi type of jew. Jews are not Whites. Below, see a good representative of White.

What if every time we Whites came across Indian arrowheads or Indians' buried bones, we called White authorities to secretly cart them off and conceal them from public knowledge?

As you know, we Whites don't do that. We Whites know that The Truth Never Fears Investigation.

But Indians and jews are, in fact, secretly carting off and hiding the discoveries all across North America that clearly show that White people were here thousands of years ago. How clearly? Forensic scientists and anthropologists can easily identify bones, especially skulls, by race, and they have done so. (Link to a [forensic science page](#). But be wary: the skull they chose to display as “Caucasoid” has the sloping forehead typical of jews, not of Whites!) Let me present a short list. After the list, I will provide further commentary. However, I recommend that you do not click on any links until after being informed by the entire list.

Preliminary facts: Please compare these simple facts against the main list farther below. Starting with the oldest:



This Norwegian beauty, a White woman, has the tall forehead and lack of brow ridges common among us Whites.

The great pyramid-building civilization of what we call “ancient Egypt” was only about 4,600 years ago.

- The height of what we call “ancient Greece” was only 2,500 years ago.
- The height of what we call “ancient Rome” was only 2,000 years ago (and Christianity was invented at that time in the Middle East).

Now, the list. Note: These are not presented in order by age, but most of them are older than “ancient Egypt”:

1. The 9,000-year-old “Kennewick Man” found near Kennewick, Washington, in July of 1996. [Link to article](#). The article mentions other finds, including a 10,000-year-old mummy of a “Caucasoid” man.

2. “Radiocarbon dating that proves the Bosnian Pyramid Complex dates back at least 25,000 years has been revealed by an international team of scientists led by Dr. Sam Osmanagich.” This quote is from an article reprinted on the admirable [Hardon’s Blog](#). Don’t be distracted by the “energy beam” aspect. The point is that our ancestors built those pyramids — larger than the White-built Great Pyramid of Egypt. The Bosnian Pyramid Of The Sun complex [direct link is here](#). No surprise, a crypto-jew archaeology [official from Egypt](#) denies the truth of the Bosnian pyramids.
3. In Ireland, the New Grange complex was constructed more than 5,000 years ago. Direct link to the [New Grange website](#).
4. China has a trove of 4,000-year-old mummies of White people. They kept this secret for a long time, of course. [Link to article](#) written by JB Campbell, published in 1997, with documentation references and links.
5. *Ancient American* magazine offers a [free issue of their publication](#) as a pdf file. It’s from about 1999, but it alone contains enough information to add up and conclude that our White history has been destroyed (and who are the destroyers?) and that ongoing unearthed evidence is suppressed. For example, see the article about the underwater megaliths and the underwater “road” found off the island of Bimini. It’s underwater because the ocean level was far lower when the seaport was built thousands of years ago. Another example: In the late 1990s, the Minnesota Indian agency was being given possession of unearthed skeletons and allowed to dispose of them in secret locations, which is still going on, of course. The secrecy is a policy from Washington, D.C., and the Smithsonian Museum to destroy and suppress the fact of ancient White skeletons and artifacts found in abundance in the U.S.A.



6. The Orkney Islands are loaded with precision-placed mounds such as this one. Liars and dupes call them “tombs.” Officially called “cairns,” they were never tombs but actually shelters and classrooms in the navigation-school system.

About 4,000 years ago, the [Ring Of Brodgar](#) was constructed among the Orkney Islands as a sea-navigation school complex. One of its main purposes was to provide training and point the


way straight to Iceland, where ship captains could then easily hop to Greenland and then to North America. The author reveals that the metric system, although usefully simple as it is based on ten, is obliterating our ancient White system of Standard Weights and Measures, based on the inch. Our fake historians call the original mile the “Greek mile,” but our ancestors’ stone placements and inscriptions prove that the inch, the mile, and the whole system was used by our much more ancient White ancestors. And the navigation-school complexes prove that our more ancient ancestors knew trigonometry, knew the Earth is round, and knew the rotation speed of the Earth. Yes, 4,000 years ago, at the very least.



Ancient skulls from the Cahokia area. Most such skulls have been confiscated and hidden from us. Compare these skulls with those in the top photo of this article. These are not African (negroid), probably not Mongoloid (including most Asians and most American Indians). I would like to see the center-right skull in profile to further assess the forehead, nose bone, and cheekbone.

The Cahokia Mounds of Illinois, USA, which evidence says were built about 5,000 years ago, have been misidentified and misinterpreted by the Smithsonian since the late 1800s. Why does it take [a U.S.-born scientist working in New Zealand](#), whose name is [Martin Doutre](#), to expose and fully explain the clear design and purpose of the system of mounds and marker stones? Another site in New Hampshire (one more of many, many sites especially along the Atlantic coast) is easily recognizable. About it, a scientist said that “the Mystery Hill site reveals a probable start date for the construction there as long ago as 2000 to 2500 B.C. This coincides more closely to the culture that built the great megalithic sites found at Stonehenge and Avebury in England and the immense Ring of Brodgar in Scotland (3000 B.C.).” Here is [a list of articles about other sites](#) around the world.

8.



This is a map of the Octagon portion of the complex. The colored lines were added by Martin Doutre to show angles, distances, and patterns used by our ancestors in navigation by Sun, Moon, and stars. Measurements are directly proportional to those of the Great Pyramids, Stonehenge, and other sites.

[The Octagon and related structures](#) at Newark, Ohio, USA, was documented by various organizations including The American Antiquarian Society in the early 1800s. Evidence shows that the site is part of a massive system of such works all over the eastern half of what is now the U.S.A. The author states: “If we are to await the anthropological and DNA fingerprinting evidence, related to mound builder’s skeletons, then perhaps results will be available in a few decades when and if the political climate, affecting valid archaeological incentives, makes a dramatic detour in favour of uninhibited scientific investigation.” As with the Cahokia Mounds (Number 7 above), the measurement system and other evidence suggests an age of about 5,000 years. The [final page on The Octagon](#) offers useful comments and conclusions.

(Caution: The Octagon pages introduce references to jew history, which I find suspect. For example, why believe there ever was a “Temple Of Solomon”? Just because the jews say there was? Just as Manly P. Hall injected false jew history into our White history (see my [article](#)), it *may* be that [Martin Doutre](#) is a crypto-jew and likewise injecting false jew references into our history. This is a strategy jews have used repeatedly: the false plants are later cited as references in the works of others. Such is the state of our jew-infested world that we must carry healthy skepticism everywhere we go.)

That’s the list. But here’s an important bonus item:

Scroll down two-thirds of the following linked page to get to an excellent list by this researcher in New Zealand of “[What’s And Why’s?](#)” For example, when remains are found in New Zealand, from 4-foot-tall people to 7-foot-tall people,

“Why are such remains, and skeletons, usually handed to Maori, or carefully slipped out of the public arena into oblivion?”



For fun and comparison, here are pictures of a White man (me, James Laffrey), the jew Edgar Bronfman Jr., and Barack Obama Sr., who we are told was the father of the half-jew half-African Barack Obama installed as president. Most Africans also have the prognathism (base of nose and the upper teeth extend forward of the eyes and forehead) as exhibited by the jew Bronfman. We don't have that. Look at the Norwegian beauty again for comparison.

You see, this confiscation and concealment of evidence is not only happening against us in the U.S.A. but is happening in all White countries. It is also happening in countries that were White but where the Whites foolishly allowed themselves to interbreed into oblivion, such as in Portugal and Egypt. (Thus, those countries sank into low-IQ mediocrity, to never again be leaders in sea power nor superior construction.)

For example, I googled “indians’ buried bones” and looked at a few of the hits. [This one](#), in West Virginia, says they got an opinion from the Smithsonian and gave the estimated 44 sets of bones to the local Indians for reburial. No further opportunity for identification or analysis. Many hits describe Indian “burial mounds” that certainly weren't originally burial mounds. None of the mounds were burial mounds in the Orkneys system, the Cahokia system, the Octagon system, and other such complexes.

Add It Up

We have documented, photographed, translated, verified proof of giant rock structures built many thousands of years ago — some long before “ancient Egypt” — in many places around the world. All of them were built according to the same system of weights and measures, displaying the same wonderful knowledge of the Earth, knowledge of trigonometry, knowledge of navigation by the Sun, Moon, and stars. Some of those rock structures are underwater, but they were not built underwater. They were built when the ocean level was far lower than it is today. Ocean levels have fluctuated because of ice ages when so much water was stored in ice, when glaciers covered much more of the Earth's surface.

We have documented, photographed, verified proof of skeletons and skeleton parts of ancient White people who lived and died in or near every location of the giant rock structures. From Egypt, to Bosnia, to the Orkney Islands, to Cahokia in Illinois, to Bimini Island, to New Zealand, and more.

Only one kind of people is proved to have been capable of designing, engineering, and constructing the huge structures that display measurements that “set in stone” the knowledge of the round Earth, the Earth’s rotational speed, the distances and angles to distant locations, and the identity of the designers. That one kind of people is White people, our ancestors.

Only one kind of people is proved by skeletal finds, artifacts, ancient artwork, and ancient manuscripts to have sailed to all of these locations around the world. We know they made the ships, we know they built the ports, we know they erected statues to their own ancestors (and later, enemies broke the noses off of so very many of them — isn’t it easy to guess why?). That one kind of people is White people, our ancestors. (The seafaring Chinese? No comparison. Don’t be distracted by the enemy’s individual scarecrows. View the entire farm, view the entire forest, view the map of the world.)

The destruction of our history

Who deliberately separated us from our ancestors’ knowledge?

Starting about 2,000 years ago, the answer is clearly jews. As jews forced the spread of their invention Christianity into Rome and then northward, they systematically murdered our resistant leaders and systematically collected and destroyed our ancestors’ historical documents. They also systematically destroyed many structures and works of art. Example: They destroyed the great Library of Alexandria, Egypt.

This search and destroy policy against us and our history went so far as to include even the Norse “mythology” about Nature, and our nature, from across Scandinavia. What has been recovered has been the rare remaining written records of the Eddas (essentially songs that were taught generation after generation to maintain and add to racial knowledge and principles), but the records were written by the Church’s monks and priests less than a thousand years ago, who surely selected and edited in deference to Church edicts. We have well-meaning Whites now who are trying to revive that Norse mythology and make it a kind of religion to replace the mind poison of Christianity (and the other jew-invented religions: Islam and Judaism).

But to make a slice of our ancestors' old tales a religion is a mistake. Surely, with ancestors who had sea-navigation schools 4,000 years ago, we are a race who has outgrown the mental crutch of religion and can be guided solely by our verifiable knowledge about Nature.

We know that jews have taken possession of the Dead Sea Scrolls and refuse to allow independent — that is non-jew — scientists to have access to them. (Revilo Oliver, and other Whites, have written of this jew crime.)

We know that jews came with Christopher Columbus (who may have been a jew himself) a mere 521 years ago and falsely claimed to have “discovered” our continent. (See Henry Ford’s publication *The International Jew*, page 20 of the pdf file, for this long-suppressed knowledge.

Click [WhiteSchool](#) page, Item 8.)



Gouverneur Morris (spelling varies), infiltrator of our Founding Fathers, corrupt member of the secret convention of Founding Fathers who wrote the Constitution. He was a jew. This image is either a sketch or a black-and-white version of a painting from 1753. If it is less than accurate, we can expect the inaccuracies to hide infamous jew features. Yet, the forehead, nose, and lips say “jew.”

We know that jews have systematically infiltrated our government from the beginning, and by the time of 1913 the jews succeeded in having enough jews in government and owning the American media to inflict the jew-owned Federal Reserve corporation on us. With the massive theft of money from our entire economy, the jews have funded false science, anti-White organizations, and “Native American” concealment of the historical artifacts of *our* ancestors.

If this had been done against the jews, they would be crying “crime against humanity!” But we will not employ their propaganda term “humanity.” It is a lie intended to obliterate race awareness.

What the jews have done against us is a crime against our entire race. Meanwhile, we have helped the other races to unearth and document their ancestors' remains and scarce accomplishments. (Remember, we invented science — which is the systematic study and recording of analyses, with conclusions based on openly reported and verified evidence.) Our generosity has been suicidal, as the other races take and take but do not give — partly because most of them lack the intelligence to invent and give anything of value to us.

But the jews are the anti-humans. The jews have the intelligence to invent and deploy schemes of deceit, treason, murder, and genocide. Jews have the racial solidarity to carry out their schemes nationwide and worldwide. Theirs is a mentality of insatiable greed, incapable of feeling guilt and remorse. Their well-known 3,000-year history is one of deliberate atrocities against all other races.

Their crime of destroying our race's history and preventing us from the benefit of our ancestors' wisdom is a capital crime against our race. Justice calls for capital punishment.

Jews are the lying bankers. Kill them. Jews are lying professors. Kill them. Jews are lying administrators of government-funded museums. Kill them. Jews are senators and representatives. Kill them.

We must finally react to this endless war jewry has inflicted upon us. We must fight back. The opportunity for heroism right now is in guerrilla tactics, killing one or two targets, and cleanly withdrawing to live, plan, and act again and again.

We must reduce the enemy jew population among us. Right now.

After we destroy jewry, we will resurrect our history and again lead this world by Honor and Truth.

Signed,

James Laffrey

Why Was The Convention In Philadelphia Secret? The Painful Truth About The Writers Of The CONstitution.

Posted on [25 July 2013](#) by [wwwjames](#)

Why Was The Convention In Philadelphia Secret? The Painful Truth About The Writers Of The CONstitution.



Produced for the victors, this famous painting gives a wrong impression of what happened in the 1787 Convention in Philadelphia, a convention authorized to improve the Articles of Confederation but instead tore up the Articles.

Please allow me to go back to the year 1786 in our race's and our country's history, and let us tour a short, historic chain of events, which was the actual overthrow of the 12-year successful government under the Articles Of Confederation.

But first, one introductory question:

Is this subject old, dead, and not important today as we strive to overthrow the enemies who rule over us?

No, it is vital. Why? Because we must understand this shocking historic chain of events, and who committed the high crimes and misdemeanors, so as not to ignorantly repeat any of those mistakes. With all our might we must endeavor to establish a new and proper government for the security of our people, for the future of our race, and for a mighty country never again to be a world villain nor a victim to any anti-White force.

The Confederation of 13 States


In 1776, the colonies declared themselves independent States and united in a fight against corrupt British rule. (With relatively few changes, The Declaration Of Independence can fit our situation today.) Soon after that, a group of the Founding Fathers wrote and signed the Articles Of Confederation as their constitution, the framework for the union, the basic law by which all must abide.

Although Maryland was slow in signing on, the 13 united states fought through the subsequent war against Great Britain (headquarters in London, England) and emerged victorious.

Following the war's end, the Confederation, the united states, continued successfully though with some deficiencies arising from the limitations of the Articles Of Confederation.

Note: What did “confederation” mean? The meaning of “federation” and “confederation” meant a joining for mutual benefit but while retaining each member’s status as an otherwise independent State. This term, from which the adjective “federal” was born, is very important. By the end of this article, the reader will know who co-opted this term, usurped this term, and reversed its meaning so as to confuse the public and demonize their opponents.

Hamilton’s Annapolis meeting of 1786



Actually, Hamilton was no “federalist.” He was a leader of the group who usurped that term, who co-opted that term. Hamilton was instrumental in wiping out the truly federal government of the original United States.

One year before the so-called Constitutional Convention was held in Philadelphia, Alexander Hamilton (a lawyer, previously a member of Congress, and a bank founder from New York) and a relatively small group of both famous and obscure men held a meeting in Annapolis, Maryland. This

appears to have been a secret meeting, but whether it was secret or not, it is a very interesting event in the chain of events that resulted in the Constitution replacing the unanimously adopted Articles Of Confederation.

My searches thus far have turned up scant documentation of the Annapolis meeting. Various government and university sites offer bits, and Wikipedia (owned and operated by jews) offers a list of attendees. The sites variously describe either Hamilton or James Madison as the head of the meeting. Yes, that Madison is *the* James Madison Jr. who went on to play the role of referee in the so-called Constitutional Convention, at which Hamilton was also a key figure.

Here, before I provide that list of attendees at Annapolis, I should explain why I say the “so-called Constitutional Convention.” It was originally called simply a convention to consider options for enhancing the Articles Of Confederation. After the convention, the misleading, half-truth title “Constitutional Convention” was attached. One other note: The many quotes in this article can speak for themselves, therefore I have allowed myself to add colorful commentary based on my knowledge, which is justified toward countering the bias we have been fed our whole lives.

The attendees at the Annapolis meeting were, according to Wikipedia:

New York: Egbert Benson and Alexander Hamilton

New Jersey: Abraham Clark, William Houston, and James Schureman

Pennsylvania: Tench Coxe


Delaware: George Read, John Dickinson, and Richard Bassett

Virginia: Edmund Randolph, James Madison, Jr., and St. George Tucker

From what we gather while reading the documents I refer to in this article, the main powers at that time were the States of Virginia (Number One), Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts. Notice that Virginia and Pennsylvania are represented above, with Virginia having Governor Edmund Randolph and the ever-present Madison.

I think we must add New York to the group of main powers because of New York City, and of course Hamilton was a New York delegate.

The Annapolis Report



James Madison Jr., a leader with Hamilton at Annapolis and then most prominent in the Convention in Philadelphia.

Link [to the Report](#).

By all the accounts I have found, Hamilton wrote the final “Report” that resulted from the Annapolis meeting. We are told that the Report was delivered to their five State legislatures, the confederation’s Congress, and to the other States’ governors.

What are the most important pieces of that Report?

Hamilton referred to himself and the attendees as “Commissioners to Remedy Defects of the Federal Government.”

Given the list of attendees above, we know that the other eight States had no representative at this Annapolis meeting. Hamilton reported:

“That appointments of Commissioners have also been made by the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and North Carolina, none of whom, however, have attended; but that no information has been received by your Commissioners, of any appointment having been made by the States of Connecticut, Maryland, South Carolina or Georgia.”

Hamilton decorated his little group’s agreement with the term “unanimous” and went on to exaggerate the number and import of “defects in the system of the Federal Government.” However, despite the supposed seriousness of the many defects, Hamilton identified none of them because to identify them would have been “a useless intrusion” of information into his report:

“Your Commissioners decline an enumeration of those national circumstances on which their opinion respecting the propriety of a future Convention, with more enlarged powers, is founded; as it would be a useless intrusion”

As shown by the last quote immediately above, and others in the Report, Hamilton pressed for “enlarged powers” for the next attempt to remedy defects or deficiencies in the Articles Of Confederation.

Hamilton actually called for a particular time and place for the next attempt:

“to meet at Philadelphia on the second Monday in May next, to take into consideration the situation of the United States, to devise such further provisions as shall appear to them necessary to render the constitution of the Federal Government adequate to the exigencies of the Union; ...”

Finally, Hamilton also laid out a process, one he later urged avoiding. The future group was to write out their remedy “and to report such an Act for that purpose to the United States in Congress assembled, as when agreed to, by them, and afterwards confirmed by the Legislatures of every State, will effectually provide for the same.

Below, we shall see why Hamilton did not want to write down his group’s topics of discussion, and we shall see why he and his fellows later feared putting their Constitution’s fate in the hands of State legislatures.

Congress Issues Orders, February 1787

Hamilton’s Annapolis meeting ended in September 1786. In the following February, the year being 1787, Congress authorized a meeting to which all States were invited to send delegates. The orders followed Hamilton’s prescription. The meeting’s official opening, however, was delayed as Hamilton and others waited for the arrival of what they, themselves, decided would be a sufficient number of States represented short of 13. Congress said:

...

” Resolved, That in the opinion of Congress, it is expedient, that on the second Monday in May next, a convention of delegates, who shall have been appointed by the several States, be held at

Philadelphia, for the sole and express purpose of revising the articles of confederation, and reporting to Congress and the several legislatures, such alterations and provisions therein, as shall, when agreed to in Congress, and confirmed by the States, render the federal constitution adequate to the exigencies of government, and the preservation of the Union.”

(source: a U.S. government publication looking back on that period in history, as quoted in the Robert Yates book to be cited and linked below.)

It is very important to note Congress’s stated purpose for the convention. From the above quote: “for the sole and express purpose of revising the articles of confederation” to “render the federal constitution adequate to the exigencies of government, and the preservation of the Union.”

That does not say to replace the Articles Of Confederation. It says to revise them, which means to enhance them, improve them, in light of known deficiencies.

Invitations and Refusals

Each State had the right to send delegates to the planned convention set for less than three months later (the wait was from mid February to mid May). How the States chose them, I don’t know. But a most noteworthy invitee absolutely rejected the invitation. He refused to attend.



Patrick Henry. This image is from a U.S. government archive. A photo of a color painting of Henry is in the banner atop this website.

Patrick Henry is that Founding Father from Virginia who refused to attend the convention to begin in May 1787 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He opposed the secrecy and he opposed a much stronger

central government. That's plenty — the secrecy being enough reason. But personally, I suggest there were more reasons, as Henry surely had heard of the Annapolis meeting, and he knew well some of the men involved.

Henry's conviction on secrecy, as later expressed in debates in Virginia, was very clear:

“The liberties of a people never were, nor ever will be, secure, when the transactions of their rulers may be concealed from them.”

(source: [this page](#) on www.constitution.org)



Willie Jones

Patrick Henry wasn't the only one who refused or declined. Another famous name, Samuel Adams, from Massachusetts. Willie Jones was another decliner, from North Carolina.

Rhode Island never sent anyone to attend. Oh, little Rhode Island is a very interesting subject, home of the main port of the immensely profitable, barbaric, jew-owned slave trade from Africa, yet also home to men such as William West who led an armed protest of more than a thousand men into the State's capital on the Fourth Of July, 1788. Let us remember William West when we arrive, below, at a conclusion about this chain of events.

Others refused to attend. This teachingamericanhistory.org page offers the following:

73 delegates were appointed to the Constitutional Convention. 18 declined their appointments:

Richard Henry Lee (Virginia), Thomas Nelson (Virginia), Patrick Henry (Virginia), Abraham Clark (New Jersey), John Neilson (New Jersey), Richard Coswell (North Carolina), Willie Jones (North Carolina), George Watson (Georgia), Nathaniel Pendleton (Georgia), Henry Laurens (South

Carolina), Francis Dana (Massachusetts), Gabriel Duvall (Maryland), Robert Hansen Harrison (Maryland), Thomas Stone (Maryland), Charles Carroll (Maryland), Thomas Sim Lee (Maryland), John Pickering (New Hampshire), and Benjamin West (New Hampshire).

Surely, each of those 18 decliners mentioned above had a group of allies in their States. Our national media, academia, and government publishers have flushed them down the Memory Hole.

Introducing Mr. Robert Yates and Mr. John Lansing

New York's very well known delegate was Alexander Hamilton. But two other New York delegates unknown nowadays were Robert Yates and John Lansing, who are now prominent in my mind. Allow me to offer very brief introductions.

Robert Yates was born in Schenectady, New York, in 1738, and became a lawyer, worked in the state capital of Albany, and earned the nickname “the honest lawyer” as even then, of course, such a man was rare in high places — especially in New York. When the revolutionary war broke out, Yates was already in government and continued to serve there. At the time he attended the Convention in Philadelphia, he was a 49-year-old justice on New York State's Supreme Court, and later became Chief Justice. He died relatively poor, as do many good men who honorably shun, as did he, taking advantage of position. (No image of Yates. My searches turned up conflicting images labeled as Robert Yates, with most main biography sites having no image at all.)



John Lansing. One source says he had a small speech impediment.


John Lansing, identified as a junior in some accounts, was born in Albany, New York, in 1754. Thus, Lansing was 16 years younger than Yates, who was related by marriage. During the revolutionary war, he was a military secretary for a general. Later, from 1780 to 1790, he served mostly as a member of the State legislature, including a term as Speaker. Also during that decade, he served a term in Congress and some years as mayor of Albany.

The Main Event: Convention In Philadelphia

Let me begin by starting at the end, but very briefly. When the convention ended in September 1787, the group still in attendance voted to make all notes of the convention secret, and they put them in the hands of the president of the convention, George Washington. Yes, secret. And even the great men opposed to the Constitution honored the secrecy agreement. Why? Honor. Honor poorly placed. Apparently, nothing was published until 1821.

James Madison's *Notes On The Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787* is the most popular publication of notes on who said what during the convention in Philadelphia. I have read every word of it, while taking notes, and read it all again on a different website to compare versions. (Both sites are linked below.) When I quote from Madison's Notes, I will say so. Madison's publication was not the first.

A different publication, which preceded the Madison publication and surely spurred the Madison publication as a defensive reaction, is this:



The title page of the historic publication of the notes of Robert Yates. I believe it was first published in 1821, as the page signed by the editor carries that date. But this page says 1844, perhaps a later edition.

Secret Proceedings And Debates of the Convention Assembled at Philadelphia, 1787. (We find the long title often abbreviated different ways on websites.) This book, published in 1821, credits Robert Yates as the author (see brief bio above).

Yates had died, his wife had put control of his notes in the hands of another, and John Lansing (see brief bio above) decided that the time had come to publish the truth about what had gone on in that Convention. Remember, Yates and Lansing were both delegates from New York having no choice but to be in the company of Hamilton.

Lansing copied the complete set of notes by Yates and put it all in the book along with a powerful section by Luther Martin, a delegate sent by Maryland to the Convention in Philadelphia. My opinion is that this Yates-Lansing-Martin book is more reliable than the subsequent Madison version of events. Most of my quotes in this article will come from the Yates book and will say so. Teachers should only teach what is good and correct. The Yates book should be taught to every student of our nation.

The Beginning



Luther Martin

Let us enter the room with Luther Martin, 39 years old, and see what he sees has already been done. This is from the Yates book, where we find the full presentation Martin gave to his Maryland legislature about his experiences at the Convention. Martin entered through the guarded door and into the historic room of high ceiling, wooden furniture, and some “illustrious men”:

“It was not in my power to attend the convention immediately on my appointment. I took my seat, I believe, about, the 8th or 9th of June. ... Before I arrived, a number of rules had been adopted to regulate the proceedings of the convention, by one of which, seven States might proceed to business, and consequently four States, the majority of that number, might eventually have agreed upon a system, which was to affect the whole Union. By another the doors were to be shut, and the whole proceedings were to be kept secret; and so far did this rule extend, that we were thereby prevented from corresponding with gentlemen in the different States upon the subjects under our discussion; ...”

Martin was shocked, as you will soon know for certain by further quotes below. Let us restate those two points very plainly.

1. Although 13 States made up the country, the group at the Convention decided that they needed only Seven States in attendance to reach conclusions. And since a majority of Seven is Four, a group of Four States would be able conclude whatever they so desired. A mere Four States could produce a new Constitution and attempt to impose it on the entire country.
2. The secrecy rule meant that the attendees could not discuss any of the Convention's issues with any wise men outside those doors, back in their State capitals, nowhere.

From both Yates' and Madison's notes, we learn that the first big business on the issues had been the unveiling of a plan that basically said what the U.S. Constitution says now! It had been written already. (This may remind the reader of the huge Patriot Act, written before 9/11 and then presented after 9/11 as if it had been written as a "patriotic" reaction to the terror events of that day.) The governor of the most powerful State, Gov. Edmund Randolph of Virginia, gave a long speech and then presented the plan to the attendees.

Yates, in his notes for that day of May 29th, reported of Randolph:

"He candidly confessed, that they were not intended for a federal government; he meant a strong, consolidated union, in which the idea of States should be nearly annihilated."

The next day, May 30th, Randolph moved for the approval of the following conclusions:

"1. Resolved, That a union of the States, merely federal, will not accomplish the objects proposed by the articles of the confederation, namely, common defence, security of liberty, and general welfare.

"2. Resolved, That no treaty or treaties among any of the States, as sovereign, will accomplish or secure their common defence, liberty, or welfare.

"3. Resolved, That a national government ought to be established, consisting of a supreme judicial, legislative, and executive."

I ask the reader to note the use of the word "federal" in Resolve 1, which is the proper usage. Randolph and his allies of Madison, Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, and others, are here against

the *federal* Articles Of Confederation. They are the anti-federalists. But later, they deceitfully usurp the term “federalists” and label Patrick Henry, Yates, Lansing, Martin, and others as “anti-federalists.”

Resolve 2 says that no agreement among the currently sovereign States under the Articles Of Confederation will accomplish their goals.

Resolve 3 uses the term “national” government, which was clearly understood by the Founding Fathers as a government that would “annihilate” State governments and eventually reign tyranny upon them.

The Randolph plan, later known as the Virginia Plan (and the “national” plan, and the “system” plan), would overthrow the current country’s government. Congress had authorized them to improve the Articles Of Confederation of the current country, not tear up the Articles and replace them with a different kind of government. It was a plan of overthrow by a set of leaders. What is another common, historic name for such a thing? Treason.



George Washington, at 45 years old.

Did any Founding Father in the room at that time point out the obvious? Not George Washington.

An aside: Washington is famously quoted as having said that “an armed society is a polite society.” And as the later Aaron Burr versus Alexander Hamilton gun duel showed, insults that went beyond a man’s ideas to strike the man personally could result in a call to duel and death. The infamous Burr killed the infamous Hamilton, but far too late for the good of the country. So, in Philadelphia, the men endeavored to remain polite.

Charles Pinckney, however, a delegate from South Carolina, spoke out. (South Carolina had two Pinckneys, the other being Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, and the notes are not exactly clear about them. Here, I believe it was C. Pinckney rather than C.C. Pinckney.) As reported by Yates, C. Pinckney said that *if* they were to vote in favor of the very first resolution, Resolve 1,

“it appeared to him that their business was at an end; for, as the powers of the House in general were to revise the present confederation, and to alter or amend it, as the case might require, to determine its insufficiency or incapability of amendment or improvement, must end in the dissolution of the powers.”

Immediately following that, Yates added:

“This remark had its weight, and, in consequence of it, the first and second resolves were dropped, and the question agitated on the third.”

Then, Resolve 3, for the “national” government, was somehow seen as acceptable to discuss and possible to approve without putting “their business at an end.”

Who voted for this Resolve 3 of the Randolph plan, this Virginia plan, this BigStates’ “national” “system” plan? As reported by Yates:

“For the resolution,—Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Against it, —Connecticut, New York divided, New Jersey, and the other States unrepresented.”

The big three were for the overthrow: Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts, along with three others. New York would also have been for it if Hamilton had got his way, but New York was “divided” because Yates and Lansing were also from New York and voting against Hamilton.

So, “national” government won and “federal” government lost. Yet, the convention did not end there.

The honorable men did not quit in disgust. Not yet. Did they think they could persuade enough others to turn the tide? Did they simply want to witness the full extent of what the majority would concoct?

“Warmth” on Suffrage for Congress

The Articles Of Confederation had provided for Congress to be one house of representatives from the States. But the new, “national” government plan called for Congress to have two houses of representatives. This division of representation for each State gave rise to long and repetitious debates over the months of the convention, often stirring delegates to speak with great “warmth.” Nowadays, we think speaking with warmth means speaking with gentleness and likely affection. But in 1787, “warmth” was a polite term for “fire.” Indeed, there was shouting, to the brink of fisticuffs and duels.

Although Yates reported a simple and debateless approval of the basic idea of a two-house Congress, Luther Martin reported that he, Martin, “warmly” opposed it, and in his presentation to the Maryland legislature, Martin destroyed it. James Madison argued that a second house was needed to “check and balance” the first house, and vice-versa.

I say that Madison’s argument is ludicrous, and it is a great way to build a gigantic, expensive government in conflict with itself. Further, it smells of “divide and conquer,” doesn’t it? I would distill the issue this way:

If your main house of representatives needs to “checked” by a second house, then your method of choosing the representatives failed. Fix that.

And this:

If you divide one rotten apple, you get two rotten halves. Pick a new and healthy apple.

By all accounts — by Madison, Yates, and Martin — the fire roared in debates over the following necessities:

- Who would choose the representatives for each house of Congress?
- And how many votes would each State have in each house of Congress?

Let us focus on the second question. That issue of how many votes for each State was referred to as “**suffrage**” in the Convention. Nowadays, we think of “suffrage” as the right of every adult citizen to vote. But in relation to Congress, it was an issue of how many votes each State would have on each and every proposed law and treaty.

The Articles Of Confederation had each State as an equal with every other State in Congress. Each State had one vote. That is “**equal suffrage**.” This Convention in Philadelphia also had equal suffrage, as each State, with no matter how many delegates in attendance and no matter how wealthy various delegates were, had exactly one vote.

Luther Martin, in agreement with Yates, Lansing, others, *and Congress*, wanted to keep and enhance the Articles Of Confederation. They said: “[I]n a federal government, the parties to the compact are not the people, as individuals, but the States, as States; ...”

On suffrage, Martin offered an example intentionally lopsided to make the principle clear:

“Suppose, for instance, ten individuals in a state of nature, about to enter into government, nine of whom are equally wise, equally strong, and equally wealthy, the tenth is ten times as wise, ten times as strong, or ten times as rich: if, for this reason, he is to have ten votes for each vote of either of the others, the nine might as well have no vote at all; since, though the whole nine might assent to a measure, yet the vote of the tenth would countervail, and set aside all their votes. ...”

Martin, in a lengthy passage in his presentation to the Maryland legislature, thoroughly and persuasively applied that principle to the States. As individuals in the federal government, each State must be equal. Neither wealth nor population should ever enter into it.



Gouverneur Morris. An “expert in finance,” his personal dishonor brought him a pegleg. This image is either a sketch or a black-and-white version of a painting from 1753. If it is less than accurate, we can expect the inaccuracies to hide infamous jew features. Yet, the slant forehead, nose, distinctive lips and wide mouth suggest “jew.” Combining appearance with behavior, I conclude that G. Morris was a secret jew (the term is “crypto-jew”).

But the Madison-Hamilton group, and to that group we should add the important Gouverneur Morris (spellings vary; he was not a governor) from Pennsylvania, insisted for months that population and wealth should determine representation. And the other slave States joined them, making a majority, in a deal that counted the slaves as wealth — as assets. Slaves were very expensive. The slaves were never considered citizens. Some honorable men, who didn't agree with counting wealth, argued: *Why count slaves but not count horses and cattle?* We shall see the “three-fifths” count of slaves appear below, which was added to the new Constitution as a compromise on how much wealth to count. Now, I shall pile on one more piece of amazing evidence on the **suffrage** issue. In Madison's Notes back on May 28th, in a mere footnote, he admitted:

“It was pressed by Gouverneur Morris and others from Pennsylvania, that the large States should unite in firmly refusing to the small states an equal vote, ...” But Madison, from Virginia, then claimed this: “The members from Virginia, conceiving that such an attempt might beget fatal altercations between the large & small States, and that it would be easier to prevail ... in the course of the deliberations, ... discountenanced & stifled the project.”

Thus, Madison and his Virginians were with Morris and his Pennsylvanians. It seems obvious to me that they had planned before the Convention began to deny “equal suffrage.” But there in a footnote, Madison claimed, thus admitting, that the Virginians had advised a slower approach, flexing their power more subtly, feigning a desire to compromise, instead contriving and manipulating to make it “easier to prevail.” I describe their intentions that way because after we read both books, and after we read through the later debates in conventions in Virginia and Pennsylvania, we know they did it that way.

Alternative Plan

The delegates opposed to overthrowing and annihilating their own State governments prepared and proposed an alternative plan.



William Patterson (also “Paterson”) presented the Jersey plan, and then he was absent during the final month of the Convention, yet he returned to sign the Constitution. Later, President Washington put him on the Supreme Court, as pictured above.

Yates reported, on June 14, that Mr. William Patterson from New Jersey moved to postpone all till the morrow when he would submit “principles to form a federal system of government, materially different from the system now under consideration.” Note the word “system.” Yates, Lansing, Martin, and others began using the term “system” in the Convention, and later made it a very negative label for the “national” government plan of the big states and Hamilton.

Patterson’s motion to adjourn was agreed to, and the convention adjourned for the day.

On June 15, as reported by Yates, Patterson read his plan. It would enhance the powers of the federal government. With the Articles of Confederation at its core, his plan added authority to handle the complaints about commerce, etc. And following the BigStates’ plan, he added a limited Executive branch and a limited Judicial branch. (The full plan is given in the Yates book, as are the others.)

Madison immediately tried to divert attention from that plan by calling for a report from the committee that had been assigned to flesh out the BigStates’ “system” plan.

Lansing responded by saying they ought to postpone all a day to prepare for the very important consideration of the Patterson plan in contrast with the “system” plan.

Hamilton then took a turn, saying he was not fond of either plan because they were both “federal” plans, which he didn’t want.

We know this Hamilton statement was insincere, to put it mildly, because Hamilton had voted all along for the BigStates’ plan. However, he was setting up for a maneuver soon to be revealed.

Following Hamilton, the convention voted to adjourn for the day.

I now turn to Luther Martin to describe what happened to the Patterson “Jersey” plan. Remember, Martin was speaking to the Speaker and full Legislature of Maryland at the time (bold added):

“The members who prepared these resolutions were principally of the Connecticut, New York [but not Hamilton -- jtl], Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland delegations. The honorable Mr. Patterson, of the Jerseys, laid them before the convention; ...”

“The result of the reference of these last propositions to a committee was a speedy and hasty determination to reject them. I doubt not, Sir, to those who consider them with attention, so sudden a rejection will appear surprising; but it may be proper to inform you, that, on our meeting in convention, it was soon found there were among us three parties, of very different sentiments and views.

“**One party**, whose object and wish it was to abolish and annihilate all State governments, ...

“**The second party** was not for the abolition of the State governments, nor for the introduction of a monarchical government under any form; but they wished to establish such a system, as could give their own States undue power and influence in the government over the other States. ...

“**A third party** was what I considered truly federal and republican; ...”

Martin included himself in the third party, rightly so. Martin’s description fits very well with the results of the Convention that we all now know: The first party and the second party made deals — especially over suffrage, commerce, and slavery — to form an unbeatable majority. This majority, just as Madison and his Virginians had predicted, did “prevail” over the truly federal and republican Americans.

The Hamilton maneuver

On Monday, June 19, 1787, with 11 States represented (out of 13), which was most often the case, Alexander Hamilton exposed the purpose behind his previous insincere assertion that he favored neither of the main plans.

Hamilton presented his own plan. But before doing that, he gave a long speech. Among his tactics, he twisted the authority that Congress and the States had given the conventioners by claiming:

“the institution of a good government must be the sole and express object of your deliberations.”

His “good government,” as everyone knew, did not include their federal government and its Articles Of Confederation.

Another tactic: Hamilton actually used Virginia, his ally, in a fearmongering ploy, saying that in the future Virginia may be so big and powerful as to “become indifferent to the concerns of the Union.” Thus, according to Hamilton, the central government must be supremely powerful and have “force” ... “force of arms” to control any such tyrannical State.

As I mentioned before, the Madison-Hamilton group would usurp the popular term “federal” and would label as “anti-federalists” the group actually loyal to the federal government. In this long speech of 19 June, Hamilton began to usurp the principle of “equal representation”: He labeled the Jersey plan as proposing “unequal representation”!

Dear readers, may I insert an aside here to place Hamilton’s methods into the context of history? I will simply ask: What kind of people, in fact what race, is infamous in history for employing such methods as usurping terms and reversing the truth throughout the last 2,000 years?

Hamilton did not stop there. However, I must refer interested readers to the Yates book to learn more of Hamilton’s assertions.

The Hamilton plan

In hindsight, in the scheme of things, Hamilton offered a plan that went further than the BigStates’ “system” plan. It had no chance to be adopted. The motive behind it could have been none other than to construct the psychological ploy of giving the “system” plan a middle position, making the “system” plan look like the “moderate” plan or the “compromise” plan. Upon seeing details below, I beg the reader who disagrees (after reading all of the source documents mentioned here) to offer a plausible alternative explanation.

The reader may see the full Hamilton plan in the Yates book. Here, I will mention several noteworthy nuggets.

- Hamilton said a president would be less dangerous if elected for life rather than a mere several years.
- He would give the president the power to veto any and all laws approved by Congress.
- He would give the president the power to pardon all offenders, except for convicted traitors.
- He originated the “electoral” system that we now have a version of, now called the “Electoral College.”

- He said of his two-branch Congress: “I would give them the unlimited power of passing all laws, without exception.”
- The Senators were “to be elected by electors,” ... and remain in office for “life.”
- He would put national government courts into each State with their rulings supreme over all State laws and courts.
- He would appoint a national government officer to serve in each State to veto any State law that conflicted with national law.
- He would put all of the militia in the States under national government control.

It may also be useful to note that Hamilton referred to his plan as “this plan,” but later he claimed that he had merely offered ideas at the Convention, not an actual “plan.”

Again, this plan was clearly a ploy to place a most-extreme plan on the table so that the extreme BigStates’ plan would look “moderate.” Can anyone plausibly disagree?

Jersey plan “not admissible”

On June 19, as a perfect cog in the machine of Virginia-Pennsylvania-Massachusetts-Hamilton, Mr. Rufus King of Massachusetts made a motion for the convention to reject the Jersey plan as “not admissible” and for them to return their focus to the BigStates-Virginia-system plan — which was now the “middle” plan of three.

Yates reported:

“Mr. King’s motion was then put. For it, seven States; three against it; one divided. New York in the minority.”

Note: New York being in the minority, rather than being “divided,” likely means that Hamilton was not present for that vote, thus allowing Yates and Lansing to determine the New York vote.

At this point as I was reading the Yates book, I put the following reaction in my notes: “*No man of honor ought remain here. They ought to at least leave, report to their States, and rally a group to arrest or kill the remaining conventioners.*”

Please understand, a year or so ago when I read the Madison Notes for the second time, I already had enough knowledge to recognize and to note that the majority was creating a “Monster” central government. Therefore, when I was very recently reading the Yates book, my patience with the

obvious treason of the Madison-Hamilton group was already depleted before reaching this passage in which seven of eleven States completely rejected the effort of the true Americans.

Repeat: “*A group to ... kill the remaining conventioners.*” Is that extreme? I refer again to William West of Rhode Island, who later led a large armed protest against ratifying the Constitution. Also, our founders had used their guns on the enemies under the British flag. That’s what “keeping and bearing arms” is all about, killing enemies. The Convention in Philadelphia was more than half full of enemies and they deserved to be killed.

Charles Pinckney had suggested, rightly so, that their business ought be at end. And others spoke likewise along the way, though I have not included quotes from them. And they spoke again later, very strongly.

Yates, on this same day of June 19, reported that Luther Martin spoke out, ending with this:

“Our accession to the Union has been by States. If any other principle is adopted by this convention, he [Martin] will give it every opposition.”

Why would any true Americans remain in that den of treason?

In my notes, as I read about the action day after day up to June 25, I wrote: “*All that’s going on is the bad guys are keeping the others in the room and wearing them down, wearing them out, as best they can, so they get the Monster without igniting violent opposition.*”

Honorables Yates and Lansing depart

On the 5th of July, Robert Yates and John Lansing left the convention, never to return. Luther Martin reported their departure. I will present a long quote by Martin, which includes that report. My reason is to also deliver what must come as a shock to most Americans.

Martin spoke of George Washington and Benjamin Franklin, as Martin had done previously with both politeness and frankness, but I have withheld such remarks until now. One more note in preface to Martin’s remarks: Franklin was at that time the President of Pennsylvania, though since then Pennsylvania changed their system and began using the term “governor.” Now, let us listen to Mr. Martin, as he reported his experiences to the Legislature of Maryland:

“Mr. Speaker, I think it my duty to observe, that, during this struggle to prevent the large States from having all power in their hands, which had nearly terminated in a dissolution of the convention, it did not appear to me, that either of those illustrious characters, the honorable Mr. Washington or the President of the State of Pennsylvania, was disposed to favor the claims of the smaller States, against the undue superiority attempted by the large States; on the contrary, the honorable President of Pennsylvania was a member of the committee of compromise, and there advocated the right of the large States to an inequality in both branches, and only ultimately conceded it in the second branch on the principle of conciliation, when it was found no other terms would be accepted. This, Sir, I think it my duty to mention, for the consideration of those, who endeavour to prop up a dangerous and defective system by great names.

“Soon after this period, the honorable Mr. Yates and Mr. Lansing, of New York, left us; they had uniformly opposed the system, and, I believe, despairing of getting a proper one brought forward, or of rendering any real service, they returned no more.”

If you read the Yates book in which Martin’s full report is given, you will get a better understanding of what Washington and Franklin did and did not do — especially Washington.

Why did Martin stay? He explained his and some others’ decision to stay in this way:

They wanted to “see what kind of a system would ultimately be formed..., yet reserved to themselves, in the most explicit manner, the right of finally giving a solemn dissent to the system, ...”

Far too polite. Martin stayed, saw what kind of system was ultimately formed, and departed in disgust about two weeks prior to the Convention’s official end.

The Executive and Judicial branches

Since virtually all of the delegates were in favor of establishing Executive and Judicial branches of the country’s government, there is no need for me to use space on the debates about them. Suffice to say, however, that there were passionate debates regarding how to choose the president and judges, and how much power to give them. As the reports by Yates, Martin, and Madison show, the divisions were generally along the lines already established, with the delegates in favor of the new “system” pushing for maximum powers.

White is right

Very important to know is who specified “White” people and who did not. The original BigStates’ plan submitted by Virginia Gov. Edmund Randolph did not specify “White” people, nor does their Constitution, which is what we have now. The original plan said, in regard to suffrage in Congress:

“2. Resolved, therefore, That the right of suffrage, in the national legislature, ought to be proportioned to the quotas of contribution, or to the number of free inhabitants, as the one or the other may seem best, in different cases.”

“Free inhabitants” only. Later, this changed, though only temporarily, as we know from their final product.

But the Jersey plan, the true federal plan, submitted by Mr. Patterson and favored by Yates, Lansing, Martin, and others, did specify “White” people. This occurred in the clause about raising funds:

“3. Resolved, That whenever requisitions shall be necessary, instead of the present rule, the United States in Congress be authorized to make such requisitions in proportion to the whole number of white, and other free citizens and inhabitants of every age, sex, and condition, including those bound to servitude for a term of years, and three fifths of all other persons not comprehended in the foregoing description, except Indians not paying taxes; ...”

We see “white” as first and paramount, and then “other free citizens and inhabitants” including the Whites bound to servitude but not the African race — the slaves. Slavery was a touchy subject which they did not want to name in governing documents. Most of the delegates were against slavery but were also against using force against their own brother States to get rid of slavery. For money-raising purposes, the Jersey plan called for the government to count “three-fifths” of the Africans. This “three-fifths” was later employed by the majority in a deal with the slave States to count the slaves as assets, as wealth, to increase the slave States’ representation in Congress.

Later, after many debates and votes had taken place on the BigStates’ plan, the “system” was rewritten in a committee and came out saying what the rejected Jersey plan had said. This would appear to have been an empty token of compromise. Quote:

“7. Resolved, That the right of suffrage in the first branch of the national legislature ought not to be according to the rule established in the articles of confederation, but according to some equitable ratio of representation; namely, in proportion to the whole number of white and other free citizens and inhabitants, of every age, sex, and condition, including those bound to servitude for a term of years, and three fifths of all other persons not comprehended in the foregoing description, except Indians not paying taxes in each State.”

On August 6, with the majority marching along to victory, they issued a draft they called “Draft Of A Constitution.” A Committee Of Style (Hamilton was known to be a member of that committee) added a preamble in a sneaky step toward adding the wide open, generalized, undefinable preamble they put on the final product. This draft began (bold added):

“**We the people of the States** of New Hampshire, ...” and continued listing all of the States. As we know, the final draft says only “We the people...” and deletes “the States” both symbolically and literally.

As for Whites, this Draft Of A Constitution included us specifically:

“Sect. 3. The proportions of direct taxation shall be regulated by the whole number of white and other free citizens and inhabitants of every age, sex, and condition, including those bound to servitude for a term of years, and three fifths of all other persons not comprehended in the foregoing description (except Indians not paying taxes); ...”

As we know, the Convention’s final draft changed yet again, without any reported debate on “White” nor on many other important details, such as “We the people.” Here is the new preamble, and it is followed by the section where “white” has been silently deleted.

“We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution of the United States of America.”

Patrick Henry later pointed out how wrong that preamble was, and he was right.

And here, their Constitution with “white” deleted:

“... shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to servitude for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other persons.”

What does the unopposed (as far as we know) removal of “White” from the CONstitution suggest to us?

First, it suggests to me that most of the true White members of the Founding Fathers took their Whiteness for granted in a country that had been founded and built by Whites for 11 years already. It also suggests to me that the true White men in that room were ignorant of the true threat of jewry. Neither the Madison Notes nor the Yates book makes any mention of “jews.”

Jews

Did the true Founding Fathers, that is, the White men, know there were jews among them? It seems certain that they knew of jews, though it may be that they did not know there were jews in the Convention.

- During the Revolutionary War, generals Benedict Arnold (the infamous traitor) and George Washington (who we are now better acquainted with, and who later made Hamilton the first Secretary of the Treasury) each had a jew as aide-de-camp (David Franks and Isaac Franks, both of the same extended jew family).
- Madison, a little man of less than 100 pounds, in 1771, had studied Hebrew at Princeton and reportedly became fluent in that jew language.
- Also, jews were known to be in finance and as merchants. Haym Salomon was a jew and financier whose name is on documents related to the revolutionary war and other transactions after the war. (However, don't believe the jew lies that Salomon “saved” the American confederation by lending money to the war operations. He was a shark and a fraud who should have been imprisoned or executed. For the asking, I will supply a source for that, though it comes with a huge caution.)

Furthermore, could the Founding Fathers not have known that jews were the owner-operators of the massive slave trade? It seems beyond reason.

I should add here some comments about the famous quotes on jews attributed to Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin. I would like to believe them, but I no longer do.

- Washington and Jefferson spoke of bankers/financiers, and the word “jew” has been inserted. However, Jefferson did write in a letter (in 1813) that he agreed with another man’s assessment of the jews’ Talmud, the jews’ racial rulebook, as despicable, a “wretched depravity.” (At bottom, see two links to that letter.)
- In regard to Franklin, we are told that C.C. Pinckney recorded in his diary that he had heard Franklin say Franklin agreed with Washington in regard to the jews and that the jews should be banned from the country. I have had a link for years that opens an image of what looks to be the cover of the Pinckney diary, so I believe the diary existed/exists, but I haven’t seen the claimed entry. Franklin was so mind-poisoned by Christianity (or very well acted so), along with the fact I’ve read of Franklin’s contributions to all “churches” including the jew synagogue in Philadelphia, and the early and large jew population in Philadelphia, and Franklin’s performance in the CONvention in Philadelphia, I highly doubt that he would have said the jews must be “banned.”

There is much more evidence to weigh, and much evidence I have yet to see. I invite the reader to offer verified links to such evidence. Meanwhile, I tentatively conclude that some Founding Fathers were ignorant of jews, some other Founding Fathers were knowledgable about jews but likely thought their own “friend” jews were honest (this is also ignorance, and a historical, oft-repeated mistake), perhaps a few of the men were knowing accomplices, and of course some other so-called Founding Fathers were crypto-jews.

Alexander Hamilton and Gouverneur Morris were two of the crypto-jews. In this Convention, based on behavior alone, we could suspect Madison and Randolph. By names and which side they were on, we could suspect two or three more.

“Illustrious” Names

Nearing the conclusion of this article, it would be very useful to provide some key facts about the most famous men, the “illustrious names” as Luther Martin said he had thought of them and referred to them until experience removed the luster.

Alexander Hamilton. A crypto-jew. He was a financier. He was a ringleader for jewry in America. In 1784, he was a founder of the Bank of New York. He was instrumental in the Annapolis set-up for the CONvention in Philadelphia. He was instrumental in the con of the CONvention. He was appointed by Washington to be the first Secretary of the Treasury, and he promptly accomplished giving the country’s money system to jewry. He was killed in a duel with the traitor Aaron Burr, sparing the USA decades more of Hamilton’s treason.

George Washington. He is credited with commanding the American forces to victory in the Revolutionary War against the Brits. But he was very lax in treatment of General Benedict Arnold while Arnold was committing treason. Washington surely was an accomplice in the set-up for the CONvention. He was made chairman, and undoubtedly that was prearranged, the chairmanship allowing him to remain silent on all issues so as to not soil his reputation. Thus preserved, he was the shew-in first president under the new CONstitution, and he installed Hamilton atop the Treasury.

Ben Franklin. From the Notes of Madison, we learn nothing of great import about Franklin at the CONvention, which was held in Franklin's Philadelphia. From Yates and Martin we learn that Franklin was, though nearing death, a near-silent power behind the overthrow of the Confederation. Also, Yates reported this Franklin fool's gold: "... *Franklin observes, that representation ought to be in proportion to the importance of numbers or wealth in each State; that there can be no danger of undue influence of the greater against the lesser States. ...*" Furthermore, on June 28, a day in which Martin and Lansing made a heroic offensive and Madison scrambled to control it, Franklin brought the day to adjournment with feeble nonsense. In response to that, in my notes, I wrote: "Franklin. A sickly, elderly, Christian-mind-poisoned man, obviously incompetent to deserve an official chair in a governmental meeting." See the Yates book for more. Franklin served the CONspiracy well.

James Madison Jr. He is widely described as the "father" of the CONstitution. Prior to that treason, he had studied Hebrew at Princeton and reportedly became fluent in that jew language. Later, he served in the legislature of Virginia. He worked for "freedom of religion," which is actually anti-White, since the major world religions are clearly anti-White. He was with Hamilton and cronies in the Annapolis set-up for the CONvention. He pretended to function as a referee in the CONvention, as especially portrayed in his own Notes. But in fact he was the ringleader using both bait and whip to advance the CON and defeat the true federalist Americans. Later, he became the fourth president (the third was Jefferson). From my own research in addition to the research I did for forensic scientist James Starrs, I offer the following: Under Madison, the War Department made life difficult for Jefferson's great protege Meriwether Lewis, a national hero on track to future presidency. But Lewis was murdered while serving as the governor of the new Missouri territory. Madison's government conducted no investigation, did nothing to secure the body, leaving the great American explorer, leader, and governor to be buried by locals in an unmarked grave in nowhere, Tennessee. Evidence made it obvious that there was a conspiracy involved. I have written about this before, though now I have a deeper understanding.



Thomas Jefferson

Thomas Jefferson. This brilliant Founding Father was not in the USA throughout the CONstitution period. He was serving as our ambassador in France. Patrick Henry referred to Jefferson during the Virginia debates on the CONstitution, saying Henry had received a letter from Jefferson opposing ratification of it. Could it be that Hamilton, Madison, and cronies in the Annapolis meeting chose the date for the Convention based on the expectation of Jefferson's continued absence? If Jefferson had been in the room, and if he had opposed Madison and Hamilton, I dare to say we would not have the CONstitution. Oh, jews would still have infiltrated, corrupted, and deceitfully seized much power, but their progress would have been slowed. Many States would still have "White" in their constitutions. The so-called "Civil" War, contrived and instigated by international jewry, almost certainly would not have happened. More recently, States would have been in control of their own militias and would have successfully opposed nonWhite immigration and integration — which presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy forced upon States at gun point. States could have prevented jew monopolization of the media. Many other jew-inflicted ills could have been prevented, stopped, or greatly slowed. My gosh, we would not have been on the wrong side in World Wars 1 and 2, killing our blood brothers, the offspring of our common ancestors. That said, I must further scrutinize the very large record of Jefferson — someday.

Conclusion

Now we know. On first knowing this shocking truth, it is mentally painful, isn't it? It was for me. As you can see, I still hold onto some Founding Fathers as admirable. I won't, yet, let Jefferson go. I hold to Patrick Henry, and now I have Robert Yates, John Lansing, and Luther Martin, too. There were others in every State, though much research would be required to sort out the pretenders from the true Americans.

Now that we know, we will not repeat their mistakes.

- We will not trust any jew. We will destroy all jews once and for all.
- We will not create a new monstrosity government to replace the current monstrosity. Instead, we will establish a new government based on White governments that worked in the past very well for our White race — and we will improve upon those models. The Articles Of Confederation are a base to use and enhance. Adolf Hitler's governmental organization, in which he strove to establish an entire heirarchy based on merit alone — not wealth, not fame, not place of birth, but on merit alone — also provides a model to consider. (He didn't expel the jews fast enough, nor thoroughly, thus leaving their traitor network in place, fatally poisoning Germany from within.)
- And our election aspect certainly will not include people voting for strangers. (See the Appendix page for more on Voting For Strangers. Link below.)

As I said at the top, I say again: With all our might we must endeavor to establish a new and proper government for the security of our people, for the future of our race, and for a mighty country never again to be a world villain nor a victim to any anti-White force. But that is Step Two. Step One is killing the jews.

Signed,

James Laffrey

Links to some sources consulted

- The featured book, *Secret Proceedings and Debates of the Convention Assembled at Philadelphia in 1787*. By Robert Yates, including John Lansing and Luther Martin. Published 1821, 1844: <http://www.archive.org/details/secretproceeding00unit>

Direct link to the pdf file of the Yates

book:<http://archive.org/download/secretproceeding00unit/secretproceeding00unit.pdf>

- Annapolis Convention, the wikipedia page, including their list of attendees.http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Annapolis_Convention_%281786%29
- Annapolis Convention Report, written by Hamilton.<http://www.law.ou.edu/ushistory/annapolis.shtml>
- A source for biographical info on Hamilton, Yates, and Lansing:http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/constitution_founding_fathers_new_york.html

- A source for Hamilton as writer of charter and a founder of the Bank of New York:<http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/biographies/alexander-hamilton/hamiltons-return.php>
- Gouverneur Morris, writing of the founding of the first (treasonous) Bank of North America: “The first bank in this country was *planned* by your humble servant.” (The source link is [here](#), a very long URL to a long page claiming to be The Diary and Letter of Gouverneur Morris, pub. 1888. (I have yet to read much of this content.)

Wikipedia (jew-owned, jew-operated) claims for Morris the things for which I blame him. [Link](#).

- A source on William West and his armed protest in Rhode Island:<http://www.constitutionfacts.com/us-articles-of-confederation/the-great-debate/>
- A source for Benedict Arnold and G. Washington having jew aide-de-camps: *The International Jew: The World’s Foremost Problem*, by Henry Ford (link on [WhiteSchool](#) page, Item 8). See the chapters with “Benedict Arnold” in their titles.
- Madison’s Notes on the Convention in Philadelphia 1787 are freely available in the following two locations.

1. This site has the debates for each day on a separate text page, best for searching, best for reading offline: http://constitution.org/dfc/dfc_0000.htm

2. This site, devoted to Madison, has the debates broken into paragraphs and presented in an interactive format, in which you may choose to see definitions and descriptions of many terms and issues. However, the victors wrote the history, and the descriptions are skewed in their favor.<http://context.montpelier.org/document/notes>

- The Speeches Of Patrick Henry from the debates in the Virginia convention on whether to accept the new Constitution. The same site has the full record of the debates. In those debates, you also see the shameless double-reversal of Edmund Randolph, who had introduced the “system” plan at the CONvention, who had been in the victorious majority, but who suspiciously refused to sign the final document, and then in the Virginia convention he argued fully in favor of the new Constitution using the same deceitful exaggeration and fearmongering that he had employed in Philadelphia. <http://www.constitution.org/afp/phentry00.htm>
- William Patterson (also “Paterson”) missing the last month of the CONvention but returning to sign the CONstitution:<http://www.history.army.mil/books/RevWar/ss/paterson.htm>
- Thomas Jefferson, in a letter to John Adams, 1813, agreeing with a Mr. Enfield on the “wretched depravity” of the jews’ Talmud, the jew racial rulebook.<http://www.constitution.org/tj/jeff13.txt>

An alternate source with a handsome display of the Jefferson letter to Adams including criticism of the jews and their Talmud's "wretched depravity." <http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/P/tj3/writings/brf/jefl222.htm>

Is James Laffrey The New Adolf Hitler?

Posted on 7 November 2012 by [wwwjtl](#)



James T. Laffrey

If you'll excuse the sensational headline, let us now get down to the serious and very interesting facts of the matter.

I invite the reader to come with me and also compare yourself with Adolf Hitler on the various aspects noted below.

Most people get all of their information about Adolf Hitler from jews. The original source is jewry for all of the supposed facts saying the German leader did the following:

- started World War 2,
- mass-murdered jews,
- used gas chambers for murder, and
- intended to invade England and the U.S.A.

Now, if you are a jew, probably you want to believe your racial brothers and not believe any reports from people of other races.



Adolf Hitler, hosting the summer Olympics in Berlin in 1936. As the outstanding Black track star Jesse Owens said, Hitler did not snub him; FDR snubbed him. The truth is the reverse of what jews claim.

But if you are White, why would you believe only jews and reject all testimony, scholarship, and research results from all members of your own race?

French Whites, German Whites, Irish Whites, and others have written truth from personal experience and research. Just a few: the inventive American automaker [Henry Ford](#), French professor [Robert Faurisson](#), the German agricultural scientist [Thies Christophersen](#)(opens as pdf), the German architect [Hermann Giesler](#), the great American general [George Patton](#), the American professor of classical languages and scholar of history [Revilo P. Oliver](#), and very many more.

Why have most Americans never seen a reasonable presentation of their works? The answer is: Because jews own all of the major media from which most Americans receive their opinion-forming information.

No “nazi”

Getting back to the man Adolf Hitler, let me offer one small but mighty example of the Lie versus the Truth. The term “Nazi.”

Hitler and the members of his party, which was named the National Socialist German Workers Party, never referred to themselves as “the Nazi party” nor as “Nazis.” So, where did that label come from? It came from jews.



This is a true image of a newspaper front page from March 1933. Other newspapers' similar announcements and photos of public jew rallies of their economic war are easily found on the Internet. (click to enlarge)

Jews owned much of the German, U.S., and international media during Hitler's 10-year struggle to the top, and jews demonized him and his White German group every step of the way — which proved to intelligent Germans everywhere that Hitler was right. And then international jewry declared total economic war on Hitler and all Germans in March of 1933, less than two months after Hitler became the top leader. That was *six years before* the start of WW2. Now, can't we see who really started WW2? The same people who created the insult term "Nazi" and continue to use it in every tv program and film touching on Germany that they broadcast are the same people who started WW2. Jews.

A new Hitler?



Adolf Hitler

Adolf Hitler was anti-jew. That's for sure. And so am I. But even on this fundamental issue, we disagree.

Hitler was far too lenient. He was merely *expelling* most jews from Germany. Not all jews, merely most jews. (The [Red Cross knew](#) and reported this before jews forced them to lie.) And he put many of the expelled to work in factories, which jews hated, of course, since they detest physical labor. Hitler had a vision of putting the expelled jews on the island of Madagascar to isolate them. But nearly throughout his 12 years as Germany's top leader, he allowed White Germans who had jew spouses to keep their jew spouses along with their extended families in Germany. Very lenient. As Adam Austin of [SubvertedNation.com](#) has argued, Hitler did nothing to solve the problem of the anti-human race defiling Earth. Hitler had the chance to make great progress in Europe, and he didn't take it. (An Austin [quote here](#).)

Hitler [did not conduct mass-executions](#) — even though he knew that jews were mass-murdering Whites, including Germans, in Russia, Ukraine, Poland, and elsewhere.

Hitler did nothing to prevent the next generation of jews from infesting our countries and continuing their program of genociding us.



For example, Hitler could have ordered the simple surgery of sterilization for all jews capable of having children. That would have been “humanitarian” and would have been a giant step in a final solution to humanity’s historic problem.

During the war years, Adolf Hitler never had more than about [3 million jews under German control](#), yet the jews wail incessantly about “6 million” killed. In fact, the jew population increased during the war era, as reported by internationally agreed population reports (extensive [info here](#)). But the jew-controlled media do not share that news, do they?

So, on the most fundamental issue, Hitler and I disagree.

Hindsight is a great tool. We only have to look. In hindsight, I will not repeat Hitler’s mistakes.

1. **I will not allow any jews to remain free in our country. (A reasonable definition of “jew” can be set, for example, as “anyone who has one jew parent or two jew grandparents.”)**
2. **We will execute the proven traitors. We will imprison and sterilize the second tier of criminal jews. And we will sterilize and expel all other jews.**

That is a fair and just final solution — as much as one country can do.

That will stop the current generation of the anti-human race in its tracks in the USA. Other countries should do the same. Problem solved.

Other areas of Hitler interest


Adolf Hitler was a soldier during WW1, earning the Iron Cross for outstanding service. I have been a hunter but not a soldier and have no military experience.



A painting at Vienna by Adolf Hitler in 1908, when he was about 19 years old.

Adolf Hitler was an artist — an accomplished sketch artist, painter, and, later, an architectural designer. My artistry is mainly in music, including songwriting, although I also have written poems and short stories of which to be proud.

Adolf Hitler was a great speaker of his time — perhaps of any time. Charismatic and persuasive. Certainly, I lack his charisma. I have some experience in public speaking, and I am a popular teacher, but my persuasiveness as a public speaker is likely weak yet remains untested.



Jews want us weak, so their USDA food pyramids are the opposite of the independent food pyramid above. I suggest that quantities of fresh meat (and eggs and fish), fresh vegetables, and fresh fruit can be about the same. The USDA pyramids have always been heavy with breads. Bread is made from grass seeds — wheat is a grass. Grass-seed chemicals destroy the defenses of our mucous membranes. So, eat very little bread and other grain-related products and watch your semi-annual nose and throat ailments disappear.


Adolf Hitler, despite his deep insights into Nature and the realities of mammal life, was a vegetarian. His physical health deteriorated for a few reasons, one of which was his vegetarianism. I passed through a phase of a few years when I leaned toward vegetarianism, and I used to predict: “Someday, people are going to look back and say, ‘*You know, they used to eat the animals back then.*’” But I never was a vegetarian. I overcame that anti-nature idea, and I intend to never be a vegetarian. We

became a strong and intelligent race by eating mainly meat, vegetables, and fruit, along with a variety of nuts and seeds. That is what I do, and surely that is why I remain slim and so consistently healthy. Why was Hitler so kind in regard to England and the U.S.A. even in war? For example, apparently he ordered only an air attack on the British forces stranded on the beach at Dunkirk. Some bad weather and the chronically bad performance of Air Force commander Hermann Goering allowed the Brits to escape across the English Channel to England. Also as an example, Hitler ordered respectful treatment of all British and American prisoners, this despite correct reports that the Allies were torturing and outright murdering many German prisoners.

Why was Hitler so kind? The answer is that he believed — until it was too late — that the majority of British and American people would not stand for their lying, war-criminal leaders after the truth was well publicized. He truly thought that most Americans and Brits, especially the large portions of our populations who were of Germanic blood, would wake up and put an end to the criminal regimes of Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill. Hitler did not realize, until it was too late, that the jews' control of the media and the key government positions had oppressed the German populations since WW1 and had duped most other Americans and Brits into cheerleading for the jews' war.

I do not underestimate the power of jewry's lies in all media, from all directions, throughout our lifetimes. The truth of that heinous power is plain to see. Kindness to the enemy jews and the nonjews who choose to side with the jews and murder and maim us? I have none. Fairness and justice? Yes. Kindness, no.

On National Socialism



The jew-owned History Channel will never fairly present this speech. Hitler was the greatest, most honest leader of the last century. Only jews and the ignorant say otherwise.

Adolf Hitler was a brilliant strategist and tactician. Why did he use the term “socialist” for his party and political ideology? After all, outside of Hitler’s unique National Socialism, we know that other “socialisms” were, and are, a creation of jewry to undermine and overthrow nonjew governments. (For the USA, however, the jews have employed extreme *democracy* and *capitalism* to undermine our White Founding Fathers’ **republic**.)

Hitler adopted and adapted the term “socialism” because it was a popular and useful term among the German population at the time. He had joined the Deutsche Arbeiter Partei (DAP), which means German Workers Party, as member Number 7. He quickly rose to become its leader and added “National Socialist” to the name to make the *National Socialist German Workers Party*. (The German abbreviation is NSDAP.) His success is history. An unarguable fact. He established the greatest White republic of the last century, and wisely employed a minimum of democracy. His system, perfect for Germany, was one of individual responsibility of individual leaders atop each level of organization. No pass-the-buck legislature nor other such democratic assemblies.



The sign over the gate at the Auschwitz camp said, and still says, “Arbeit Macht Frei.” In English, it literally means Work Makes Free. Remember, the party name was German Workers Party. Germans revered productive work, and still do. Jews scoff at the sign because they detest physical labor. Notice that jews are bankers, lawyers, politicians, media mouths, actors, etc. Not farmers, not mechanics, not carpenters, etc.

But the USA is not Germany of the 1920s and 1930s. “Socialism” is a term that is dead in the water in the USA. Sincere patriots and fans of Hitler have employed the term “national socialism” here in the USA, and they have gotten nearly nowhere. Usually, they display the great swastika, too, which is also self-sabotage in the USA.



These were White men doing what only White men have done, ever. They were the best of the best. Some of us are the new best. Our children, our race, and our country require us to stand and deliver.

We must use what works for our White race as *Americans* today. We have great White founders, and they were not Hitler. **Thomas Jefferson, George Washington**, and others were great men. Not perfect, but certainly great. They are ours, as White Americans, and we must keep them, revere them, and stand on their shoulders as we rebuild this republic.

In fact, Hitler stood on their shoulders. He studied the Founders' system and learned from their mistakes. He did not allow the existence of other political parties obviously destructive to the founding culture. He did not allow jews to control vital institutions. He did not put too much power in the hands of committees and assemblies of "elected" members.

Thus, we must stand on the shoulders of our Founders and of the great White leader Hitler, too. We must hold to their principles while correcting their mistakes. For example, we must write the words "White people" and "the White race" into the Constitution. We must reduce its over-emphasis on elected bodies and increase emphasis on each leader's responsibility. Of course, we must outlaw jewry completely, and we must end the non-White incompatible populations in our country with the [current generation](#).

Conclusion



James Laffrey: White, American, correctly anti-jew.

The new Adolf Hitler? The ignorant will say that I am "worse" than Hitler. The wise will ponder whether I am a Hitler offspring or different enough to stand alone.

Hitler was the greatest, most honest, most rightly principled leader in the last 100 years. He was not perfect, as no one is, but he was truly great. Meanwhile, he was a White German of Germany, not a White American.

I am a White American.

Adolf Hitler was member Number 7 of his party and quickly rose to the top of the group he had joined.

Although I have a few supporters and many likeminded fellow White Americans, no sincere American has put his or her name on the line here, as I have. Not yet.

But we're just getting started with this rightly White effort.

Whites Will Win!

It's just a matter of how soon we get it together.

www!



Make It So

We Whites, more-so than the other races, record history, learn from our great forefathers' mistakes, and stand on their shoulders to improve our inventions, improve our communities, improve our lives, and improve the future outlook for our children.

Currently, and temporarily, jewry's roadblocks of Lies and Terror lay in our way. We will sweep them aside.

Whites Will Win! — again.

We are right. But that is not enough.

Be Right *and Fight*.

www!

Sincerely,

James T. Laffrey

Step By Step: How Hitler, I, And You Struggled To The Truth

Posted on [12 February 2013](#) by [wwwjames](#)

Step By Step: How Hitler, I, And You Struggled To The Truth

“Adolf Hitler’s Conversion”



Adolf Hitler, the great.

We all go through steps in life from believing what we have been taught since childhood, to realizing that we were taught some lies, and then to arriving at some real truth.

Five steps in that process are identified by Robert DeMarais, Ph.D., in the *Liberty Bell* magazine of Nov. 1995, pages 1-9, ([link](#) opens as a pdf file). (Note: All books mentioned in this article are available free through our [WhiteSchool](#) page.) It is a very useful outline, though not everyone

progresses in the same way. The professor's five steps are Awareness, Interest, Evaluation, Trial, and Adoption.

The professor takes us through these steps from the point of view of Adolf Hitler, using quotes from Hitler's historic autobiography, platform, and worldview titled *Mein Kampf*, which in English means "My Struggle."

As we read through the steps of Hitler's conversion from misled to master, let's each of us assess whether we followed the same steps. If not, what important differences were there? Our answers to these questions will help us better understand ourselves and help us to help others more effectively.

The professor wrote:

The Conversion of Hitler

Hitler's fascinating story of conversion is told in the chapter "Years of Study and Suffering in Vienna" in Mein Kampf (below page numbers reference the Manheim translation)

Pre-Awareness. *At an early age, Adolf Hitler was a dedicated German nationalist, an avid reader, and was interested in the meaning of history. He was angered by political issues and the lies in the press, but tried to keep silent.*

However, "Thus far I did not so much as suspect the existence of organized opposition to the Jews" (p. 52). "For the Jew was still characterized for me by nothing but his religion, and therefore, on the grounds of tolerance, I maintained my rejection of religious attacks..." (p. 52). Hitler's unwillingness was magnified by the low credibility he assigned to anti-Semitic newspapers.

Awareness. *"For a few hellers I bought the first anti-Semitic pamphlet of my life. Unfortunately, they [the pamphlets] all proceeded from the supposition that in principle the reader knew or even understood the Jewish question to a certain degree" (p. 56). Besides the pamphlet's tone was also bad. [Perhaps they used terms like Z.O.G. that were not defined or supported and initially seemed crude to Hitler.]*

Interest. *However, based on the pamphlet, Hitler was motivated to evaluate, but not without great mental anguish, "I relapsed for weeks at a time, once for even months. The whole thing seemed to me so monstrous, the accusations so boundless, that, tormented by the fear of doing injustice, I again became anxious and uncertain" (p. 56).*

Evaluation. As part of his evaluation, Hitler began to observe Jews in Vienna in a different and more critical light. He was now seeing Jews in their own culture and concluded: Zionism is incompatible with German Nationalism.

He began to evaluate the sources of the decay of German society and morals. *“The fact that nine-tenths of all literary filth, artistic trash, and theatrical idiocy can be set to the account of a people, constituting hardly one-hundredth of all the country’s inhabitants, could simply not be talked away; it was the plain truth”* (p. 58).

“And I now began to examine my beloved ‘world press’ from this point of view” (p. 58). He noted that the writers were Jews. *“Gradually I became uncertain”* (p. 59).

Trial. Hitler now had made a preliminary decision but was carefully observing his world to confirm or deny it. *“My views with regard to anti-Semitism thus succumbed to the passage of time, this was my greatest transformation of all. It cost me the greatest inner soul struggles, and only after months of battle between reason and my sentiments did my reason begin to emerge victorious. Two years later, my sentiment had followed my reason, and from then on became its most loyal guardian and sentinel”* (p. 55).

“A thousand things that I had hardly seen before now struck my notice, and others, which had previously given me food for thought, I now learned to grasp and understand” (p. 58).

“I no longer avoided discussion of the Jewish question; no, now I sought it” (p. 60).

“When I recognized the Jew as the leader of the Social Democracy, the scales dropped from my eyes. A long soul struggle had reached its conclusion” (p. 60).

Adoption. *“I had at last come to the conclusion that the Jew was no German”* (p. 61). *“I had ceased to be a weak-kneed cosmopolitan and become an anti-Semite”* (p. 64).

Apparently, Hitler was always a racist. That is, he was intensely nationalistic. His struggle took place before WWI and racialism was not as politically incorrect as it is today. Hitler’s conversion was to anti-Semitism.

Today’s recruits must transform themselves into both racials and anti-Semites. An open admission of both is one sign of full conversion. However, it is only one sign. Another is full commitment: loyalty, single purpose, persistent dedication, and hard work.

Did you follow in Hitler's footsteps? If yes, it will be your best path on which to lead others up the mountain. If no, then it would be wise to consider which path might work best under the conditions in our own country and in our own time, right now.

Here's a brief description of my own path:




1.

James Laffrey

I finally rejected both Republicans and Democrats as liars and traitors, and I realized there must be a power above the U.S. presidency.

2. I followed the money, and with help from Eustace Mullins' book on the Federal Reserve, I arrived at the supreme money power — the Rothschild family.
3. I launched my first political website, and I emailed a few famous people to ask why they don't write about the Rothschilds. At that time, I had no idea that those men — Gordon Duff, Stephen Lendmann, and John Kozy — were jews! They tried to steer me away from the Rothschilds — and, as I now know, they were steering me away from their own, their precious self-”Chosen,” the jews.
4. I researched the history of jews entering the USA and found a long history of crypto (secret) jews. After reading about jews and seeing so many photos of jews, I began to realize that I had known crypto-jews in the past — doctors, a banker, tv station managers, professors, and more. The amassed evidence told me that jews are throughout our country, hoarding assets, blocking non-jews from proper promotion, and more. Thus, I concluded that the jew race is the enemy and that we must carry the firm conviction that there are no “good” jews.
5. Yet, I was still mostly race-blind! Next, I reasoned my way to the truth that Adolf Hitler was a great White man. Finally, I allowed his book and speeches to influence me.



**THOSE WHO WILL NOT READ
HAVE NO ADVANTAGE OVER THOSE
WHO CANNOT READ**

6. *60 Liberty Bell / March 1990*

The Liberty Bell magazine is still today the most valuable magazine of truth.

Reading through the *Liberty Bell* magazine archive, and a few other sources, I belatedly woke up to the value of the White race. One landmark was my reading of Incogman.com's page on White inventions. The truth that Whites have invented nearly every single invention of value on this planet set me firmly on the proper path, on which I have strode more confidently with each passing day.

7. A final note: My path was not as straight as the outline above suggests. For example, after I overcame my race-blindness, I read Richard Fuerle's important book *Erectus Walks Amongst Us*, and I realized that I had read (or heavily skimmed) that book perhaps two years earlier, when I was not ready for it and could not accept it. This kind of experience of repeated reading being necessary happened many times.

My journey was solo. Every main step was taken on my own following my personal Aryan thirst for knowledge and answers. Only once was I given a bit of important guidance from a person I knew: My oldest brother, who began his awakening previous to mine, pointed me into the Holocaust hoax and the jews' longrunning myth of the "6 million."

I invite each reader's comments on his or her personal path and current position.

Robert Jay Mathews Speaks For Himself, Life Of White Valor

Posted on **1 April 2013** by [wwwjames](#)



Rare photo of Robert Mathews, holding his son, Clint.

Thanks to a recent commenter named “Wolzek,” I searched that unusual name and clicked to pages by a “Victor Wolzek,” having no idea whether the two are related. But a treasure of works, images, and other info was found. Here is [the index page](#) to most of it, at the [vanguardnewsnetwork](#).

In that index we find [Robert Mathews’ Last Letter](#), apparently written as a letter to the editor of a publication, likely a local newspaper. Normally, I write my own articles and include only selected quotes and facts from other sources. But this time is different. (Click the Categories menu item “Bruders Schweigen” for my series on Mathews’ group.)

Robert Jay Mathews’ own words telling his life story, briefly and eloquently, need to be republished in full. On this page, he will have the last word. On this page, my last words are these: We must take up the cause. We have learned from the victories and mistakes of The Bruders Schweigen and other rare heroes of recent history. We must add our successes to theirs. The more of us who prove ourselves as White *men* now in defense of our great race, the sooner we will win back what is ours — every inch from sea to shining sea.

[Robert Jay Matthews was killed in action against Federal agents, dying with a weapon in his hand, on Whidbey Island in December 1984.]

TO THE EDITOR:

For the past decade I have been a resident of Northern Pend Oreille County. When I first arrived in Metaline Falls, I had only twenty-five dollars to my name, a desire to work hard and be left alone, and the dream of someday acquiring my own small farm.

During my three years at the mine and seven years at the cement plant, I can safely say that I was known as a hard worker. I stayed out of the bars and pretty much kept to myself. Anyone who is familiar with Boundary Dam Road knows how my late father and I carved a beautiful place out of the woods.

All of the goals I had when I arrived were accomplished but one ... I was not left alone.

Within months of my arrival the FBI went to the mine office and tried to have me fired from my job. I was working in the electrical department at the time and my foreman, fortunately, had a deep and lasting dislike for the Feds. He was informed of the situation by the mine secretary. Had it been the mine manager instead of the secretary that the Government goons talked to, I would have lost my job.

This campaign of harassment and intimidation began because of my involvement in the Tax Rebellion Movement from the time I was fifteen to twenty years old. The Government was on me so much in Arizona that during one incident when I was eighteen, IRS agents shot at me for nothing more than a misdemeanor tax violation.

I left Arizona and the Tax Rebellion when I was twenty. I left not out of fear of the IRS or because of submission to their tyranny, but because I was thoroughly disgusted with the American people. I maintained then as I do now, that our people have devolved into some of the most cowardly, sheepish, degenerates that have ever littered the face of this planet.

I had hoped to start a new life in the state of Washington, but the ruling powers had other plans for me. When I learned of their highly illegal attempt to have me fired, I wrote a letter to their Seattle office and told them "I would take no more, to leave me alone, or I would respond in such a way that could be very painful to certain agents."

After the letter they gradually started to let me be.

I soon settled down to marriage, clearing my land, and reading. Reading became an obsession with me. I consumed volume upon volume on subjects dealing with history, politics and economics. I was especially taken with Spengler's "Decline of the West" and "Which Way Western Man?" I also subscribed to numerous periodicals on current American problems, especially those concerned with the ever increasing decline of White America. My knowledge of ancient European history started to awaken a wrongfully suppressed emotion buried deep within my soul, that of racial pride and consciousness.

The stronger my love for my people grew, the deeper became my hatred for those who would destroy my race, my heritage, and darken the future of my children.

By the time my son had arrived, I realized that White America, indeed my entire race, was headed for oblivion unless White men rose and turned the tide. The more I came to love my son the more I realized that unless things changed radically, by the time he was my age, he would be a stranger in his own land, a blonde-haired, blue-eyed Aryan in a country populated mainly by Mexicans, mulattos, blacks and Asians. His future was growing darker by the day.

I came to learn that this was not by accident, that there is a small, cohesive alien group within this nation working day and night to make this happen. I learned that these culture distorters have an iron grip on both major political parties, on Congress, on the media, on the publishing houses, and on most of the major Christian denominations in this nation, even though these aliens subscribe to a religion which is diametrically opposed to Christianity.

These are the same people who Ex-Senator William J. Fulbright and the late General Brown tried to warn us about. Henry Ford and Charles Lindbergh tried vainly to warn us also. Had we been more vigilant, my son's future would not be so dark and dismal.

Thus I have no choice. I must stand up like a White man and do battle. A secret war has been developing for the last year between the regime in Washington and an ever growing number of White people who are determined to regain what our forefathers discovered, explored, conquered, settled, built and died for.

The FBI has been able to keep this war secret only because up until now we have been doing nothing more than growing and preparing. The government, however, seems determined to force the issue, so we have no choice left but to stand and fight back. Hail Victory!

It is at this point that I wish to address the multitude of lies that the federals have been telling about Gary Lee Yarbrough and myself. Gary did not “ambush” any agents. For weeks prior to this incident they had been harassing Gary, following him everywhere, even to the hospital to visit his gravely ill daughter. The day of the mythical ambush Gary was out in his yard when he saw a forest service truck driving across his property in obvious disregard to the numerous no trespassing signs scattered about his land. He yelled at the truck to stop but it kept coming towards his house until it crashed into and destroyed a gate. At this point Gary fired warning shots into the air and the truck drove away. That ... was the big ambush.

The newspapers are saying now that Gary not only ambushed three agents but that he hit three of them. Gary did not even realize that they were FBI at the time, which is fortunate for them because Gary is an expert marksman and had he decided to ambush the FBI he easily could have killed every fed within range of his weapon.

It was until 8:00 p.m. that night that Gary realized what was actually taking place. That is when approximately thirty agents drove up to Gary’s house. Gary and a young house guest went outside to investigate the commotion. When the Feds started yelling at Gary he dropped to the ground and rolled into a ditch behind the line of government vehicles. The young house guest went running back into Gary’s residence. After waiting for three hours the FBI used Gary’s wife as a shield and a hostage and went into the house. What brave men they are!

As incredulous as it sounds Gary laid in the ditch behind the agents for five hours with his gun aimed at their backs. Had Gary really wanted to ambush these invaders then that was a wonderful opportunity to do so. Gary chose instead to give them quarter, something he would later come to regret. Gary eventually slipped out of the ditch and into the woods.

The incompetence of these gun toting bureaucrats never ceases to amaze me. Especially after their attempted ambush and murder of myself in a Portland motel. First, let me say that the FBI was not there to arrest Gary but to ambush me. They didn’t even know that Gary was in the room. The only reason they were able to find me was because a trusted friend in Room 14 was actually a traitor and an informant. The FBI has vast resources and the latest technology but the quality of their agents is

going down hill with every new recruit. That's because most of the best White men in this country are starting to realize that to be an FBI agent is to be nothing more than a mercenary for the ADL and Tel Aviv.

When I stepped out of my motel room that morning, a gang of armed men came running at me. None of the men had uniforms on and the only thing they said was "Stop, you bastard." At this, I yelled at Gary who was still inside and I leaped down the stairwell and took off running into the parking lot. A woman agent shot at my back and the bullet missed and hit the motel manager.

I rounded the corner of the motel and took off down the hill into a residential area. After running for two blocks I decided to quit being the hunted and become the hunter. I drew my gun and waited behind a concrete wall for the agents to draw near. When I aimed my gun at the closest agent I saw the handsome face of a young White man and lowered my aim to his knee and his foot. Had I not done so I could have killed both agents and still had the use of my hand which is now mangled beyond repair and which I might very well lose altogether. That is the last time I will ever give quarter.

As for the traitor in Room 14, we will eventually find him. If it takes ten years and we have to travel to the far ends of the earth we will find him. And true to our oath when we do find him, we will remove his head from his body.

I have no regrets or apologies to make for Gary or myself. In fact, I am proud that we had the courage and the determination to stand up and fight for our race and our heritage at a time in history when such a deed is called a crime and not an act of valor.

Approximately nine months ago the FBI went to my house while I was away and threatened my two year old son. That was a very big mistake on their part. After the Portland shootout they went to my house and threatened my sixty-three year old mother. Such brave men they are!

I am not going into hiding, rather I will press the FBI and let them know what it is like to become the hunted. Doing so it is only logical to assume that my days on this planet are rapidly drawing to a close. Even so, I have no fear. For the reality of my life is death, and the worst the enemy can do to me is shorten my tour of duty in this world. I will leave knowing that I have made the ultimate sacrifice to ensure the future of my children.

As always, for blood, soil, honor, for faith and for race.

Robert Jay Matthews